



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/029,249	12/28/2001	Arjen Brandsma	PB0024/US	4985
466	7590	08/27/2004	EXAMINER	
YOUNG & THOMPSON 745 SOUTH 23RD STREET 2ND FLOOR ARLINGTON, VA 22202			CHARLES, MARCUS	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3682	

DATE MAILED: 08/27/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/029,249

Applicant(s)

BRANDSMA ET AL.

Examiner

Marcus Charles

Art Unit

3682

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 June 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 10 and 13-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 10 and 13-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

### **DETAILED ACTION**

This action is responsive to the letter filed 06-24-2004. Claims 10 and 13-22 are pending.

#### ***Response to Arguments***

1. Applicant's arguments, filed 6-24-2004 with respect to non-prosecution of claim 22 have been fully considered and are persuasive. The prior final rejection has been withdrawn. A new final rejection is as follows:

#### ***Drawings***

2. The examiner has accepted the drawing correction filed 08-19-2003.

#### ***Specification***

3. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: in page 6, lines 3-4, it is not clear if "Ra" represents a unit dimensional unit of roughness. It is unclear as to how the roughness can be express in Ra because line 27, define Ra as the combine roughness. The specification is object to because it lacks proper antecedent basis for the equation " $Ra' = \text{SQRT}(Ra^2 + Ra^2)$ " as in claim 15. See CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP 608.01(0).

#### ***Claim Objections***

4. Claim 14 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form. Note claim 13, recites the speed up to 4000 rpm and claim 14, recites a speed up to 6000 rpm. The range of claim 14 falls outside the range of claim 13.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 15, 10, 13-14, 17-21 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over JP (60-95234). In claims 15, 10, 18-19 and 22, JP (60-95234) discloses the claimed invention including the innermost endless belt band (4e) having a coarse inner surface in contact with the saddle face of the element (5). JP (60-95234) does not disclose the degree of roughness between the endless band and the saddle face of the element and the distance of the rocking edge below the rocking surface. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the JP (60-95234) device such that the contact face of the inner surface of the outermost band has a roughness greater than 0.8 $\mu$ m and to have the rocking edge 1 mm or between 0.4 and 0.8 mm below the saddle face, since it has been held where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art. In re Aller, 105 USPQ 233.

In claim 17, note the carrier contact face of each of the transverse element is flat.

In claim 21, note a plurality of endless bands (4a-4d) are radially around one another.

Art Unit: 3682

Regarding claim 10, 13-14 and 20, JP (60-95234) does not disclose the properties of the lubrication oil at 100°C, the range of the primary shaft speed is up to 6000 rpm and the distance between the rocking edge and the saddle face. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art the time of the invention to select an oil with the above properties and to have the speed of the shaft up to 6000 rpm, since it has been held that where the general conditions of the claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable range involves only routine skill in the art. In re Aller, 105 USPQ 233. In addition, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to select a lubrication oil with the claimed properties at 100°C, since it has been held to be within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known material on the basis of its suitability for the intended use as a matter of obvious design choice. In re Leshin, 125 USPQ.

7. Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over JP(60-95234) in view of Hendriks. JP (60-95234) does not disclose the profile comprising grooves disposed in crossing sets. Hendriks discloses a belt having endless bands with the grooves disposed in crossing sets in order to improved lubrication. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill the art at the time of the invention to modify the coarse surface of JP (60-95234) so that the surface comprises grooves disposed in crossing sets in view of Hendriks in order to improve lubrication.

***Response to Arguments***

8. Applicant's arguments filed 03-16-2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant's argument with respect to claims 10 and 13-22 has been considered but is in view of the new ground (s) of rejection.

Applicant contended that the prior art fails to teach that the innermost surface having a surface profile providing with oil retaining grooves. It should be noted that claim 15 does not recite the inner surface has retaining grooves. In claim 16, applicant broadly recited, "a surface profiling is grooves disposed in crossing sets". Nowhere in the claims is the inner surface is surface profiling grooves disposed in crossing sets.

***Conclusion***

9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will


Art Unit: 3682

the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Marcus Charles whose telephone number is (703) 305-6877. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday 7:30 am to 6:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Bucci can be reached on (703) 308-3668. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

  
Marcus Charles  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 3682  
August 12, 2004